

**REMARKS**

Applicants' counsel wishes to express his appreciation for the courteous interview granted by the Examiner on July 26, 2005. During the course of the interview both the prior art and the 35 USC 112 claim deficiencies were discussed. Applicants have amended the claims to address the §112 concerns of the Examiner.

As discussed during the course of the interview, the subject invention relates to a prism used for turning the path of a beam of radiation through 90 degrees. The prism is designed to turn the beam by total internal reflection. In addition, the prism is designed so that the beam both enters and exits the prism at Brewster's angle thereby minimizing losses at both interfaces.

As suggested by the examiner, the rejected claims have been amended to better track the description in the specification. Specifically, the terms "first, second and third" faces have been replaced by terms "entrance, reflecting, and exit" faces (12, 14 and 16, respectively as seen in Figure 2). In addition, the rejected claims have been amended to recite that the radiation enters and exits the prism faces at the "external" Brewster angle to make it clear that angle is defined between the beam and the prism face on the outside of the prism (in the air). The term "external Brewster angle" is explicitly defined in the specification at page 4, line 5 and was used in original claims 1 and 10.

Applicants have amended claims 8, 14, and 20 to remove the reference to the "turning angle" objected to by the Examiner in favor of language recited in the specification at page 4, line 13. Finally, applicants have also cleaned up some errors in the claim language. In view of the amendments made to the claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejections based on 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

During the course of the interview, applicants acknowledged that the cited patent to Marchant (4,759,616) teaches a turning prism where the path of the beam exiting the prism is offset by about 90 degrees from the path of the beam entering the prism. In addition, Marchant teaches directing the incident beam onto the entrance face of the prism at the external Brewster angle. However, in all of the embodiments of Marchant, the beam exits the prism at an angle perpendicular to the exit face, not at the external Brewster angle as in applicants' prism. As discussed with the Examiner, the particular arrangement of the faces of applicants' prism allows the beam to both enter and exit the prism at the external Brewster angle thereby minimizing reflection losses.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the independent claims, which require that the beam both enter and exit the prism at the external Brewster angle are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the patent to Marchant and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. It is also requested that this amendment be entered as the scope of the claims has not been changed, but merely clarified in order to better track the disclosure in the specification.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: August 2, 2005

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Michael A. Stallman  
Reg. No. 29,444

Attorneys for Applicant(s)